

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

Ni9(3(crats42.29330.085 0.744 00.01 Tc16r .008 M~(M24( 26,)62~8.99,)62~8:)10(i~-p.)62m)22(. (crats)]2.2933Tji354.085 8 2s)11(t)10(

(See other side)

YEAS (77)				NAYS (21)		NOT VOTING (2)	
Republican (35 or 65%)		Democrats (42 or 95%)		Republicans (19 or 35%)	Democrats (2 or 5%)	Republicans (1)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Kyl	Akaka	Kennedy	Allard	Cleland	Bond- <sup>2</sup>	Moynihan- <sup>2AY</sup>
Ashcroft	Lott	Baucus	Kerrey	Bunning	Feingold		
Bennett	Lugar	Bayh	Kerry	Burns			
Brownback	Mack	Biden	Kohl	Craig			
Campbell	McCain	Bingaman	Landrieu	Crapo			
Chafee	McConnell	Boxer	Lautenberg	Enzi			
Cochran	Murkowski	Breaux	Leahy	Fitzgerald			
Collins	Roberts	Bryan	Levin	Gramm			
Coverdell	Roth	Byrd	Lieberman	Grassley			
DeWine	Shelby	Conrad	Lincoln	Gregg			
Domenici	Smith, Gordon	Daschle	Mikulski	Helms			
Frist	Snowe	Dodd	Murray	Hutchinson			
Gorton	Specter	Dorgan	Reed	Inhofe			
Grams	Stevens	Durbin	Reid	Nickles			
Hagel	Thomas	Edwards	Robb	Santorum			
Hatch	Thompson	Feinstein	Rockefeller	Sessions			
Hutchison	Warner	Graham	Sarbanes	Smith, Bob			
Jeffords		Harkin	Schumer	Thurmond			
		Hollings	Torricelli	Voinovich			
		Inouye	Wellstone				
		Johnson	Wyden				
						<b>EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:</b> 1—Official Business 2—Necessarily Absent 3—Illness 4—Other	
						<b>SYMBOLS:</b> AY—Announced Yea AN—Announced Nay PY—Paired Yea PN—Paired Nay	

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

after another, attacking both neighboring countries and ethnic minorities within his own country. He has ruled based on ethnic hatreds. His current genocidal assault on ethnic Albanians in Kosovo is his worst yet. If he is allowed to succeed, he will destabilize and radicalize neighboring countries and will cause instability throughout Europe. NATO may fall apart, and Europe may return to its historical pattern of constant warfare. The costs of stopping Milosevic in Kosovo are nothing compared to the costs that would be involved in stopping a continental war. We believe that Milosevic is near his breaking point. Negotiations have been going well, and we expect that he will soon concede, withdraw his forces, and allow the return of refugees. He will do so without getting any amnesty, and we believe that we will eventually see him tried and convicted as a war criminal. With victory so close, it would be a huge mistake to pass the Smith amendment. In effect, the amendment would tell him that all he has to do is hang on for a few more months because the United States will give up on September 31. He would count the days until victory. Our 18 NATO allies who have joined us in this war will also see it as a sign that the United States is ready to concede. They would rightly feel betrayed. We are not about to abandon this war. The United States must win. Therefore, we strongly favor the motion to table.

**Argument 2:**

Though we have reservations about this war, we oppose this amendment because it would be viewed as a concession of defeat.

**Those opposing the motion to table contended:**

The United States has been bombing Serbia for 2 months now. What exactly it is trying to accomplish is unclear. Congress has not approved this war, and it is allowing matters to drift. We personally believe that the United States does not have national security interests at stake and that it should get out of the war. However, with this amendment, we are not demanding that it do so. All we are doing is forcing Congress to take action. It should not dither irresolutely for years on end as it did in Vietnam. Those of us who served in Vietnam believe that we were ill-served by a drifting policy that Congress allowed the Administration to set because it did not have the courage to take decisive action. Fifty-eight thousand Americans were killed in Vietnam.

The United States started bombing after Serbia refused to sign an agreement that rebel guerrilla separatists in Kosovo had signed. That agreement, which was devised by the United States, would have NATO police Kosovo for 3 years, with an understanding that after 3 years there would be a referendum that would almost certainly result in Kosovo being severed from Serbia. Serbia, when it refused to sign that agreement, reportedly acceded to an alternative plan proposed by Russia. That plan would demilitarize Kosovo, would call for an international rather than a NATO peacekeeping force, and would not call into question Serbia's continued sovereignty over its territory. Before the United States started bombing, there were 2,000 people who had been killed in Kosovo, and there were 50,000 refugees. The United States attacked because it wanted Serbia to accept its plan and because it feared that Serbia would start a massive ethnic cleansing campaign in Kosovo. As soon as the bombing began, Serbian military and paramilitary forces unleashed a savage campaign against ethnic Albanians. Now an estimated 150,000 people have been killed and up to 1 million are refugees. Thus, one stated reason for the campaign, the prevention of ethnic cleansing, obviously has not been achieved. Kosovo has basically been emptied. Why now are we bombing? It appears that the sole reason is that we are demanding that Serbia let those ethnic Albanians back into the country.

Some Senators have suggested that we must do what is necessary to win. What exactly is meant by "win"? That definition has been vague throughout this war. Suppose we "win" and Serbia stops its attacks. Will that then mean that United States forces will be stationed for years or decades in Kosovo? If the ethnic Albanians are allowed back, they are going to comprise the vast majority of the population, and we imagine that they are going to have some hard feelings toward the minority of Kosovars who are Serbian. After two months of bombing Serbia, the United States may have to spend the next several decades protecting Serbian Kosovars. Further, who is going to pay for the damage caused by all of the bombing? The United States has gone after civilian as well as military targets, causing tremendous damage. That damage is causing harm for Serbian civilians, who cannot be blamed for the actions of their communist dictator. There will be pressure for the United States to rebuild Serbia. The United States also, for humanitarian reasons, will undoubtedly help pay to rebuild Kosovo. We have already appropriated large sums for Kosovo relief, and those sums will probably be only the tip of the iceberg no matter what the final outcome of the current war may be.

We emphatically agree that Serbia's dictator Milosevic is a brutal tyrant. There are many such brutal tyrants around the world. The United States cannot afford to fight and defeat them all. When its interests are at stake, such as when it went to war to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, it can and should fight, but it simply cannot afford to police the whole world. Our military is stretched to the breaking point. Recruitment is down, qualified personnel are leaving in droves, there are chronic shortages in spare parts, training is inadequate, and procurement of new systems has been slashed. Our military capabilities have already been sharply degraded. We cannot afford to get in battles such as the current war in Yugoslavia.

We understand that many of our colleagues disagree. Let them make their case. They will have 4 months under this amendment to say why they want this war to continue, to say what they expect to accomplish, and to provide the resources that our military needs. We believe our colleagues have a moral responsibility to provide that direction instead of letting our policy drift as it did in Vietnam. We do not see this amendment as providing aid and comfort to Milosevic--it does not force a withdrawal date, as our colleagues claim; it only forces Congress to take a stand. We urge our colleagues to show courage by voting for this amendment.